AGENDA<br>PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING CITY OF FARMINGTON HILLS JUNE 20, $2024 @$ 7:30 P.M.<br>FARMINGTON HILLS CITY HALL - CITY COUNCIL CHAMBER 31555 W. ELEVEN MILE ROAD, FARMINGTON HILLS, MICHIGAN 48336<br>Cable TV: Spectrum - Channel 203; AT\&T - Channel 99<br>YouTube Channel: https://www.youtube.com/user/FHChannel8<br>www.fhgov.com (248) 871-2540

1. Call Meeting to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Approval of Agenda
4. Regular Meeting
A. PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (PUD) OUALIFICATION 2, 2024

LOCATION: 27815 and 28025 Middlebelt Road
PARCEL I.D.: 22-23-11-477-013, -014, and -109
PROPOSAL: Construction of gasoline service station with drive-through restaurant, in a RC-2, Multiple-Family District
ACTION REQUESTED: Qualification of PUD
APPLICANT: SkilkenGold Real Estate Development
OWNER: HRA Farmington Hills, LLC
5. Approval of Minutes May 16, 2024, Regular Meeting
6. Public Comment
7. Commissioner/Staff Comments

## 8. Adjournment

## Respectfully Submitted,

## Kristen Aspinall, Planning Commission Secretary

## Staff Contact:

Erik Perdonik, AICP
City Planner
Planning and Community Development Department
(248) 871-2540
eperdonik@fhgov.com
NOTE: Anyone planning to attend the meeting who has need of special assistance under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) is asked to contact the City Clerk's Office at (248) 871-2410 at least two (2) business days prior to the meeting, wherein arrangements/accommodations will be made. Thank you.

## PUD Q 2, 2024, 11-477-013, 014 \& 109



27815 and 28025 Middlebelt Rd.
23-11-477-109, 477-013 \& 477-014
Construct gas station with drive-through restaurant


| $\square$ Tax parcel | $\square$ OS-1 Office Service District |
| :--- | :--- |
| - Minor roads | $\square$ RA-1 One Family Residential District |
| Zoning Districts | $\square$ RA-1A One Family Residential District |
| Zoning Districts | $\square$ RA-2 One Family Residential District |
| $\square$ B-1 Local Business District | $\square$ RC-2 Multiple Family Residential |
| $\square$ B-2 Community Business District |  |



Real Estate Development

May $15^{\text {th }}, 2024$
City of Farmington Hills Planning Commission
Attn. Erik Perdonik
31555 W . Eleven Mile Road
Farmington Hills, M ichigan 48336

## Re: 27815 and 28025 Middlebelt Road, Farmington Hills, MI 48334 (the "Property") Request for Qualification for PUD

Ladies and Gentlemen,

SkilkenGold Real Estate Development, (the "Applicant") is proposing to develop the Property as a "Sheetz" restaurant, which would include outdoor dining, carry-out service and fuel sales (the "Project"). The Project and Property are shown on the schematic land use plan that is being submitted with this letter.

After conversations with the City's planning, engineering and economic developments, and after receiving feedback from Planning Commission members, we are proposing to develop the Property as a PUD (planned unit development).

As set forth in the City's ordinance, the Applicant must substantiate how the proposed PUD would satisfy one or more of the City objectives set forth in Section 34-3.20.2.E. In that regard, the Applicant contends that the Project satisfies each of the following objectives of the City under Section 34-3.20.2.E and should qualify for consideration as a PUD:
i. To permanently preserve open space or natural features because they can provide a buffer between land uses

The Project includes a permanent open space area between the developed area and the residential area to the north.
ii. To permanently establish land-use patterns which are compatible, or which will protect, existing or planning uses.

The Project is compatible with other fueling station uses at the intersection of 12-Mile Road and Middlebelt Road.
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iii. To accept dedication or set aside open space areas in perpetuity.

As set forth in i. above, the Project will include a permanent open space buffer along the northerly boundary of the Property.
iv. To provide alternative uses for parcels which can provide transition buffers to residential areas.

The Project includes a land use and natural features plan which provides open space areas, substantial screening enhanced landscaping. Several additional parcels were acquired and added to the Property, beyond what was spatially needed to construct a Sheetz facility, for the purpose of adding buffering and landscaping for the surrounding residential community.
vii. To bring about redevelopment of sites where an orderly change of use is determined to be desirable.

The Property is currently vacant and the improvements are in a state of severe decline. The Applicant proposes to redevelop the Property as a restaurant but also with fuel service and convenience products. The Project will not only entirely remove the existing structures, it will make numerous improvements that will benefit the Property and the community, including:

- A first class state of the art building that includes full sections of brick and stone, awnings, cupola, numerous windows and window glazing
- Reduced impervious area of the overall site and more greenspace
- Multiple pedestrian accesses to the site
- Bike racks
- Supplementary landscaping and preservation of existing green space
- Decorative masonry 3 foot "knee wall" along frontages

We hope this analysis of the objectives that would be satisfied by developing the Project as a PUD is of assistance. Please add this to the other documents and information we have submitted in connection with our request for qualification as a PUD.
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As always, if you have any questions or if you would like additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me or any of our team. Thank you for your consideration and we look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

## Kareem Amr

Development Project M anager
SkilkenGold Development
cc: David Brucklemeyer (Sheetz)
J. Patrick Lennon (Honigman)

Farmington Hills Planning Commission 31555 W 11 Mile Rd
Farmington Hills, MI 48336

## Preliminary PUD Qualification

Case:
PUD Q2, 2024
Site:
27815 and 28025 Middlebelt Road
(Parcels 23-11-477-109, 23-11-477-013, and 23-11-477-014)
Applicant:
Application Date:
Zoning:
SkilkenGold Real Estate Development
May 15, 2024
RC-2 Multiple Family Residential District

We have completed a review of the application for PUD qualification referenced above and a summary of our findings is below.


## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

## Existing Conditions

1. Zoning. The subject property consists of three parcels zoned RC-2 Multiple-Family Residential. The parcels have had this zoning designation since 2019. Prior to that, the zoning was a mix of B-2 at the corner, $\mathrm{P}-1$ in the west-central portion of the property, and RA1 on the northern half:


Zoning in early 2019
2. Existing Development. Parcel -109 is 2.39 acres and includes a vacant 10,134 SF commercial building and parking area. Parcel -014 is 0.82 acres and is vacant. Parcel -013 is 0.82 acres and includes a single-family house and accessory structures. A senior housing project was twice approved for this property in 2019 and 2021, but was never built.
3. Adjacent Properties. Zoning and use of adjacent properties is as follows:

| Direction | Zoning | Land Use | Future Land Use Category |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| North | RA-1 | Single-Family Residential | Single-Family Residential <br> (Cluster) |
| East | RA-1A | Single-Family Residential | Single-Family Residential |
| East | OS-1 | Office | Small Office |
| East | B-1 | Gas Station | Shopping Center Type Business |
| South | B-1 | Gas Station | Non-Center Type Business |
| West | RC-2 | Multiple-Family Residential | Multiple-Family Residential |


4. Site configuration and access. The site is accessed from 12 Mile and Middlebelt Roads. The proposed development maintains a single curb cut on each thoroughfare.

## PUD Qualification

Under Section 34-3.20.2, the Planning Commission may make a determination that the site qualifies for a PUD based on the following criteria and procedures.

Criteria for qualification. In order for a zoning lot to qualify for the Planned Unit Development option, the zoning lot shall either be located within an overlay district or other area designated in this chapter as qualifying for the PUD option, or it must be demonstrated that all of the following criteria will be met as to the zoning lot:
A. The PUD option may be effectuated in any zoning district.
B. The use of this option shall not be for the sole purpose of avoiding the applicable zoning requirements. Any permission given for any activity or building or use not normally permitted shall result in an improvement to the public health, safety and welfare in the area affected.

Although zoned for a multiple-family residential use, this site is located at a prominent intersection with high traffic, directly across from other gasoline stations. Although a gasoline station is more intensive than an RC-2 use, the proposed development will include significant landscape buffers between the building and adjacent properties, preserving land as open space.
C. The PUD shall not be utilized in situations where the same land use objectives can be accomplished by the application of conventional zoning provisions or standards. Problems or constraints presented by applicable zoning provisions shall be identified in the PUD application. Asserted financial problems shall be substantiated with appraisals of the property as currently regulated and as proposed to be regulated.

Although the applicant initially considered a rezoning for this site, it was ultimately determined that the PUD process would offer the necessary flexibility to accomplish project goals. The proposed use is not permissible in the RC-2 District, however, this site may have been developed as a gas station if rezoned to B-1, a classification that is consistent with the Future Land Use designation in the Master Plan. B-1 Zoning is also consistent with the adjacent gasoline stations. With that, the PUD request also grants the applicant the ability to request a drive-through as a part of this development, which is not a permitted use in the B-1 Zoning District.
D. The Planned Unit Development option may be effectuated only when the proposed land use will not materially add service and facility loads beyond those contemplated in the Future Land Use Plan unless the proponent can demonstrate to the sole satisfaction of the city that such added loads will be accommodated or mitigated by the proponent as part of the Planned Unit Development.

Although this site will have a considerable impact on traffic at this intersection, it is unclear whether this impact would be greater than maximum development with uses permitted within the RC-2 Zoning District. The Planning Commission may request a traffic study as a part of its consideration.
E. The Planned Unit Development must meet, as a minimum, one of the following objectives of the city (criteria addressed by the applicant in bold):
i. To permanently preserve open space or natural features because of their exceptional characteristics or because they can provide a permanent transition or buffer between land uses.

The applicant points to an area permanently reserved for open space which serves as a buffer between the use and the adjacent residential to the north.
ii. To permanently establish land use patterns which are compatible or which will protect existing or planned uses.

The applicant has highlighted and responded to this objective, referring to the site's compatibility with other gasoline stations sharing the same intersection. However, it should be noted that the surrounding gasoline stations do not have drive-through restaurants, nor would such use be permitted.
iii. To accept dedication or set aside open space areas in perpetuity.

The applicant points to their plans to develop a permanent buffer area as a part of this development. The Planning Commission may require restrictive covenants to ensure that open space remains as such.
iv. To provide alternative uses for parcels which can provide transition buffers to residential areas.

The applicant highlighted this qualification criterion by again pointing to the extensive landscaping and screening proposed as a part of these plans, as well as the assembly of land to ensure adequate buffer space. With that, it should be noted that although these plans include buffers between uses, the underlying zoning district was intended for a residential use.
v. To guarantee the provision of a public improvement which could not otherwise be required that would further the public health, safety, or welfare, protect existing or future uses from the impact of a proposed use, or alleviate an existing or potential problem relating to public facilities.
vi. To promote the goals and objectives of the Master Plan for Land Use.
vii. To foster the aesthetic appearance of the city through quality building design and site development, the provision of trees and landscaping beyond minimum requirements; the preservation of unique and/or historic sites or structures; and the provision of open space or other desirable features of a site beyond minimum requirements.
viii. To bring about redevelopment of sites where an orderly change of use is determined to be desirable.

The applicant points to the site's extended vacancy and current condition as characteristics that indicate change is desirable. In their response, the applicant noted several improvements proposed as a part of this development, including high quality architecture, reduced impervious cover, increased green space, pedestrian access, bike racks, supplementary landscaping, and a decorative "knee wall" along frontages.

Though only one objective must be met by the plan, the applicant's narrative directly addresses objectives I, ii, iii, iv, and viii.
F. The PUD shall not be allowed solely as a means of increasing density or as a substitute for a variance request; such objectives should be pursued through the normal zoning process by requesting a zoning change or variance.

The primary reason for seeking a PUD here appears to be to allow a land use which is not permissible in the underlying RC-2 Zoning District. If rezoned to B-1, the applicant could develop the site for a gas station, convenience store, and restaurant use, but a drive-through would not be permissible.

## Conceptual Site Plan \& Use:

1. Summary of Proposed Use. The planning commission is not assessing the site plan in detail. However, the conceptual plans and illustrations provided by the applicant provide an indication of the type of site plan the planning commission can expect if preliminary qualification is granted. The applicant is proposing to construct a $6,139 \mathrm{SF}$ commercial building for use as a gasoline station, including 12 fueling positions, with carry-out food service, including a drive-through and outdoor dining. The plans include demolition of the existing single-family house on the northernmost parcel, as well as the former Ginopolis restaurant.

## 2. Master Plan.

a) Future Land Use. Parcel -109 is designated as Shopping-Center Type business on the Future Land Use map. The 2009 Master Plan describes uses permitted in Shopping Center Type Business as those that are compatible with each other in the shopping center environment and that have the least impact beyond the buildings. The Zoning Plan aligns this district with areas zoned B-1, B-2, and B-4. Parcels -014 and -013 are both designated as Multiple-Family Residential on the Future Land Use Map.
b) Residential Densities Map. The residential densities map designates Parcels -014 and -013 as high density residential, which is comparable with multiple-family residential zoning districts.
c) Special Planning Areas. The parcel is not a part of any of the Special Planning Areas in the Master Plan.

Dimensional Standards of the RC-2 District. It appears that all dimensional standards will be met, though additional information will be required at final PUD and site plan approval.

| Standard | RC-2 District | Proposed |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lot Size | 8,000 SF | 4.03 acres |
| Lot width | 80 Ft | $>80 \mathrm{Ft}$ |
| Lot coverage | $35 \%$ per unit | $<35 \%$ |
| Front setback | 50 Ft | $>107 \mathrm{ft}$ |
| Side setback $^{1}$ | Additional information required | $>20 \mathrm{ft}$ |
| Residential (rear) setback $^{2}$ | Additional information required |  |
| Street Side setback |  |  |
| Building height | 50 ft | $>50 \mathrm{ft}$ |

[^0]3. Parking and Circulation. If the applicant proceeds to final PUD, a full parking analysis of the site will be necessary in order to understand what the ordinance requires, what is present, how that will change with the reconfiguration, and where pavement might potentially be eliminated. As a drivethrough use, Planning Commission will review areas provided for stacking and loading. If necessary, additional ordinance relief may be discussed at that time.

## 4. Relief Sought from Ordinance Standards

a. Permit gasoline station, convenience retail, and drive-through restaurant with outdoor dining in the RC-2 Zoning District
b. Required drive-through bypass in the customer stacking/ordering area.

We are available to answer questions.
Respectfully,
Giffels Webster


Joe Tangari, AICP
Principal Planner


Julia Upfal, AICP
Senior Planner

## INTEROFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

## DATE: June 10, 2024

## TO: Planning Commission

FROM: Jason Baloga, Fire Marshal

## SUBJECT: PUD 2-2024 (27815/28025 Middlebelt)

The Fire Department has no objection to approval of this PUD contingent upon compliance with the following requirements:
*NOTE: If the proponent finds it impractical to comply with the minimum Fire Department Site Plan Review and Design Standards, please contact the Fire Marshal to discuss the Alternate Protection provision outlined in Chapter 12 Section 12-11(4).

1. Site shall meet site access requirements in Chapter 12 Section 12-11(1) of the City Code; sites shall be designed to accommodate fire apparatus with a 50 ' turning radius. This was discussed with proponent on $6 / 10 / 24$ and will be verified during Engineering Review.
2. Hydrant coverage shall meet Chapter 12 Section 12-11(2) of the City Code (hydrants). This was discussed with proponent on 6/10/24 and will be verified during Engineering Review.
3. Underground storage tanks and hazardous materials shall be regulated according to State of Michigan requirements as well as City of Farmington Hills adopted Ordinance and Code requirements.
4. CO 2 monitoring shall be required according to International Fire Code requirements.
5. Propane exchange shall be permitted through the Building Department.
6. Pumps shall only dispense fuel with attendant present.
7. Fire lanes shall be posted and strictly enforced.
8. The minimum clearance between the finished roadway surface and any overhead obstructions shall be 13 ' 6 ".
9. Building shall be maintained in accordance with minimum Fire Prevention Code requirements.


Jason Baloga, Fire Marshal
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# EHEETZ 

## SHEETZ, INCORPORATED



## NEW SHEETZ STORE <br> "FARMINGTON HILLS"

INT. OF UEST 12 MILE ROAD AND MIDDLEBELT ROAD FARMINGTON HILLS, MICHIGAN

| BuILDING ELEVATIONS | SHEETZ SIGN $=16.55$ SQ. FT. $\times 2=33.10$ SQ. FT. <br> MTO VINYL GRAPHIC $=21.44$ SQ. FT. $\times 1=21.44$ SQ. FT. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TOTAL $=54.54 \mathrm{SQ} . \mathrm{FT}$. | 54.54 SQ. FT. |
| GAS PRICE MONUMENT SIGN | SHEETZ SIGN $=2 \theta .44$ SQ. FT. $\times 1=2 \theta .44$ SQ. FT. GAS PRICE SIGN $=26.94$ SQ. FT. $\times 1=26.94$ SQ. FT. |  |
|  | TOTAL $=47.38$ SQ. FT. | 47.38 SQ. FT. |
| GAS CANOPY AWNING | SHEETZ SIGN AREA $=13.08$ SQ. FT. $\times 3=39.24$ SQ. FT. |  |
|  | FUEL OFFERING FLAG AREA $=2.76$ SQ. FT. $\times 12=33.12 \mathrm{SQ}$. FT. |  |
|  | TOTAL $=72.36$ SQ. FT. | 72.36 SQ. FT. |





## (12) Guttr, Color to match curolacolor

(13) DOWnspout, Color: dark bronze
(14) DRIVE-THRU WINDOW (IF APPLICABLE)
(15) METAL STANDING GEAM SHED STYLE EAWNING GND FRAME ASSEMBLY
(16) BRICK SOLDDER COURSE COLOR: 680 BY CONTINENTAL BRICK
(16) COMPANY. SEE MASONRY SPEC
(18) CONTROL JOINT, SEE MASONRY SPEC
(19) STEEL Roof LADDER AND CRANKY POST, COLOR: DARK BRONZE
(20) STANDARD THROUGH WALL SCUPPER WITH CONDUCTOR HEAD \&
(21) OVERFLOW SCUPPER
(22) ALUMINUM STOREFRONT SYSTEM, SEE AG00
(23) Exterior hose bib, refer to plumbing drawing
(24) outdoor furnture
(25) ELECTRICAL RECEPTACLE, REFER TO ELECTRICAL DRAWINGS
(26) ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT, REFER TO ELECTRICAL DRAWINGS
(27) HM DOOR AND FRAME, COLOR: DARK BRONZE
28) EMERGENCY WATER CONNECTION, REFER TO PLUMBING DRAWING
(29) SEAMLLESS ALUM PANEL SYSTEM WITH EXPOSED FASTENERS, COLOR
(30) propane locke
(31) ICE MERCHANDISER
(32) RTIFILLPORT
(33) STEEL BOLLARD, COLOR: DARK BRONZE
(34) CO2 FILPORT
(35) DECorative aluminum fence, color dark bronz
(36) AUTOMATIC DOOR PUSH PLATE AND BOLLARD, BOLLARD COLOR:
(37) GAS METER AND RISER, REFER TO CIVIL UTLITY PLAN, COLOR: DARK
(38) MTO GRAPHIC DECAL, SEE SHEET A200.
(39) LIGHT CHANNEL AT PARARET COPINGG SEE ARCHITECTURAL AND
(40) Fauxm
(4) Ex
41) E-STOP \& SIGN, REFER TO UST DRAWINGS

(2) LEFT ELEVATION

日HEETZ


$\oplus$







$\frac{\text { DOUBLE-FACED GAS PRICE SIGN DETAIL - PARTIAL ELEVATION }}{\text { SCALE: } \| 2^{\prime \prime}=1 I^{\prime}-e^{\prime \prime}}$
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Convenience Architecture
and Desian P.C. 1 Sheez Way, Classurus, PA 1625


# MINUTES <br> CITY OF FARMINGTON HILLS <br> PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING <br> 31555 W ELEVEN MILE ROAD <br> FARMINGTON HILLS, MICHIGAN <br> MAY 16, 2024, 7:30 P.M. 

## CALL MEETING TO ORDER

The Planning Commission Regular Meeting was called to order by Chair Trafelet at 7:30 p.m.

## ROLL CALL

Commissioners present: Aspinall, Countegan, Grant, Trafelet, Stimson, Varga, Ware
Commissioners Absent: Brickner, Mantey
Others Present: Staff Planner Canty, City Attorney Schultz, Planning Consultants
Tangari and Upfal

## APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

MOTION by Grant, support by Aspinall, to amend and approve the agenda as follows:

- Postpone Item 4.B. REZONING REQUEST ZR 4-3-2024 until the June, 2024 meeting.

Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

## PUBLIC HEARING

## A. REZONING REQUEST ZR 3-3-2024

LOCATION: West side of Middlebelt Road, just north of Astor Avenue
PARCEL I.D.: 22-23-26-480-046
PROPOSAL: Rezone one (1) parcel from P-1, Vehicular Parking to RA-4, One Family Residential zoning district
ACTION REQUESTED: Recommendation to City Council
APPLICANT: Rane Jappaya
OWNER: 22595 Middlebelt, LLC
Applicant presentation
Rane Jappaya, 22595 Middlebelt, LLC, was present on behalf of this request to rezone one parcel from P-1 Vehicular Parking to RA-4, One Family Residential zoning district on the west side of Middlebelt Road, just north of Astor Avenue.

## Planners Review

Referencing the April 10, 2024 Giffels Webster memorandum, Planning Consultant Upfal gave the background and review for this request.

- The property in question is a little over a quarter acre. The majority of the property is zoned P-1 Vehicular Parking with a small portion zoned RA-4, One Family Residential. The property is located on the west side of Middlebelt Road, across from a mobile home park, surrounded by residential to the north and west, and with a convenience store to the south. The lot was currently unused.
- Duplexes are allowed in the RA-4 district, if the developer is using the major frontage option offered in the zoning ordinance.
- The Master Plan designated the site as a shopping center type business. The property to the south was a shopping center type business, and the properties to the north and west were designated as single family, which is consistent with RA-4 zoning, and the subject parcel is designated on the residential map as medium density.
- Portions of the site where only vehicular parking uses were permitted would accommodate single family and two-family residential uses; this would not have a considerable impact on public services or utilities.
- The wetlands map indicated there may be hydric soils on the site which should be reviewed prior to issuing of any permits.
- The applicant did not provide evidence that the site could not be developed as zoned, however the demand for vehicular parking lots with no principal use should be considered.
- The site is compatible with the neighboring RA-4 uses, and would be compatible with the B-1 parcel to the south if rezoned, as the ordinance stated that the intent of the B-1 district was to meet the day-to-day convenience shopping needs of the surrounding residential properties.
- As an undeveloped corner lot, there is the potential for a new curb cut.
- There is limited land along this thoroughfare where there is an option to construct a duplex in RA-4 zoning on a major thoroughfare.
- An amendment to current zoning would not accommodate single-family or duplex uses.
- Development in the immediate area had not changed substantially since the adoption of the Master Plan.
- Rezoning would not result in a spot zone.

In response to questions, Mr. Jappaya gave the following information:

- Mr. Jappaya believed the property was originally zoned P-1 by the previous owner to save money on taxes. Mr. Jappaya owned the residential property to the north, and Andy's Market to the south.
- Three single family homes or duplex structures could be constructed on the site if the rezoning is approved.
- The intent of the rezoning is to construct rental properties.

Chair Trafelet opened the public hearing.

As no public indicated they wished to speak on this matter, Chair Trafelet closed the public hearing and brought the matter back to the Commission.

MOTION by Stimson, support by Aspinall, to recommend to City Council that Rezoning Request ZR 3-3-2024, dated March 18, 2024, submitted by Rane Jappaya, to rezone property located at Parcel Identification Number 22-23-26-480-046 from P-1, Vehicular Parking District, to RA-4, One Family Residential Zoning District BE APPROVED.

Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

## B. REZONING REQUEST ZR 4-3-2024

LOCATION: 27815 Middlebelt Road; two (2) parcels on west side of Middlebelt Road, between Orion Court and Twelve Mile Road
PARCEL I.D.: 22-23-11-477-014, and 109

PROPOSAL:

ACTION REQUESTED:
APPLICANT:
OWNER:

Rezone two (2) parcels from RC-2, Multiple Family Residential to B-3, General Business zoning district
Recommendation to City Council
SkilkenGold Real Estate Development
HRA Farmington Hills, LLC

Postponed to June meeting.

## C. AMEND PUD 1, 2021, INCLUDING REVISED SITE PLAN 54-2-2021

LOCATION:
PARCEL I.D.:
PROPOSAL:

31525 Twelve Mile Road 22-23-15-201-270
Conversion of hotel building into independent living facility in ES, Expressway Service zoning district
ACTION REQUESTED: Recommendation to City Council
APPLICANT: Farmington Hills Real Estate, LLC
OWNER: Farmington Hills Real Estate, LLC

## Applicant presentation

Douglas Boehm, Comfort Care Senior Living, was present on behalf of this request to amend PUD 1, 2021, including Revised Site Plan 54-2-2021, for conversion of a hotel building into an independent living facility. Mr. Boehm made the following points:

- City Council approved the Final Site Plan in November, 2021.
- Renovation started in 2022.
- The words "memory care" and "assisted living" need to be replaced with "independent living" in all PUD documents. Only independent living units will be on the site.

In response to questions, Mr. Boehm provided the following additional information:

- The units will be marketed to individuals 55 and older, but would also be open to others in order to meet Fair Housing requirements.
- The site would contain 131 units.


## Planners Review

Referencing the May 9, 2024 Giffels Webster memorandum, Planning Consultant Tangari gave the background and review for this request for a PUD amendment.

- The request was to modify an approved PUD for a five-acre site near Twelve Mile and Orchard Lake Roads.
- The applicant proposes to amend the PUD to make units independent living, whereas the approved PUD contains a mix of 21 studio memory care units, 51 assisted living units, and 56 independent living units.
- The amendment would result in 131 independent living units, split into 47 studios and 84 onebedroom units.
- The parking requirement for the approved PUD was 81 spaces. Based on the standard of 0.75 spaces per unit for independent living with no kitchen facilities, the amended parking requirement would be 98 spaces. This requirement differed from a statement of 81 spaces in the revised site plan.
- The applicant was proposing 85 parking spaces on site which would require relief from the parking requirement as part of the revised PUD agreement.

In response to questions, Mr. Boehm provided the following additional information:
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- The proper building use term for the site is "boarding house."
- Units would have a small kitchenette without a stove or oven. Stove top units could be added by residents.
- 24-hour dining services would be available, but there would be no medical or custodial care provided by the facility.

Chair Trafelet opened the public hearing.
As no public indicated they wished to speak on this matter, Chair Trafelet closed the public hearing and brought the matter back to the Commission.

Chair Trafelet pointed out that there was long grass and an unscreened retention pond currently on site. Mr. Boehm indicated that both issues would be resolved.

In response to further questions, Mr. Boehm provided the following:

- Construction would resume after the amendment was approved.
- Building elevators would accommodate a gurney.
- Units would not be subsidized.
- Units would meet ADA building codes.
- Requirements of the previous PUD agreement were met.

MOTION by Stimson, support by Varga, to recommend to City Council that the application to amend PUD 1, 2021, including Revised Site Plan 54-2-2021, dated March 25, 2024 submitted by Farmington Hills Real Estate, LLC, be APPROVED, because the plans are consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the Master Plan and applicable provisions of the Planned Unit Development Option in Section 34-3.20 of the Zoning Ordinance,

## Subject to:

- Modifications of Zoning Ordinance requirements as indicated on the proposed plan.

And with the following additional recommendation:

- The Planning Commission recommends granting relief from the parking requirement to provide 13 fewer spaces than required.

Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

## REGULAR MEETING

A. LOT SPLIT 2, 2024 (FINAL)

LOCATION: 21308 Waldron Street
PARCEL I.D.: 22-23-36-329-030
PROPOSAL: $\quad$ Split one (1) parcel into two (2) parcels in RA-4, One Family Residential zoning district
ACTION REQUESTED: Lot Split approval (final)
APPLICANT: Mansoor Habib
OWNER: Mansoor Habib

## Applicant presentation

Mansoor Habib was present on behalf of this request for lot split approval at 21308 Waldron Street.
Mr. Habib made the following points:

- The lot was originally three parcels that had been combined into one.
- When Mr. Habib purchased the property, a fire-damaged home was still there; the City informed Mr. Habib that the home had to be demolished (not repaired). Mr. Habib did demolish the building, and the lot is currently vacant.
- The request was to split the lot into two lots, in order to build two single family homes.

Referencing the May 7, 2024 Giffels Webster memorandum, Planning Consultant Tangari gave the background and review for this request for lot split approval.

- The parcel is zoned RA-4 and contains 0.38 acres. The minimal lot size in RA-4 is 8,500 square feet.
- There was one place on the plans where the parcel ID was given incorrectly, that should be updated.
- Surrounding properties were all RA-4 One Family, except a portion of property across the street which was Olde Town Park.
- Parcel A and Parcel B were both proposed to have 75 feet of frontage on Waldron Street and were proposed to be 8,362 square feet ( 0.19 acres).
- The minimum lot width is 60 feet and the minimum lot size is 8,500 square feet. As noted, the proposed lots would not meet the minimum lot size requirement and will require a variance prior to Planning Commission action.
- Other parcels on the block had a standard lot size of about 50 feet by 111 feet. The proposed lots would be larger than most of the other lots on the block.
- Lots on surrounding blocks vary in size more than the lots on this block, including many with a width similar to the proposed lots.
- The proposed lots have rear to rear and side to side relationships with adjacent lots, which is typical for the area.
- The proposed division would result in a compatible relationship with surrounding parcels.
- The split would create two lots on which buildings would be oriented toward Waldron Street, as is the case with other lots on the west side of the block.

MOTION by Aspinall, support by Varga, that (Final) Lot Split 2, 2024, dated April 3, 2024, submitted by Mansoor Habib, BE DENIED, because it appears that the applicable provision of Chapter 34 "Zoning" and/or Chapter 27 "Subdivision of Land," of the City Code are not met, because the proposal would not meet the required dimensional standards.

## Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

Commissioner Stimson explained process going forward; the applicant would need to obtain a variance from the ZBA before the Planning Commission could act on this request.

Commissioner Stimson pointed out the need to review the zoning in the Olde Town neighborhood, with an eye to bringing the zoning ordinance into conformance with what has existed in Olde Town for many decades.

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

April 18, 2024, Special Meeting, and April 18, 2024 Regular Meeting

MOTION by Grant, support by Aspinall, to approve the April 18, 2024 Special Meeting minutes, and April 18, 2024 Regular Meeting minutes as submitted.

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

## PUBLIC COMMENT

Duke Orr noted that for 20 years Commissioner Mantey supported wetlands regulations and sidewalks, and progress had been made in those areas.

## COMMISSIONER/STAFF COMMENTS

Commissioner Grant wished all mothers a belated Happy Mother's Day.

## ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Grant, support by Ware, to adjourn the meeting.

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.
The meeting was adjourned at $8: 10 \mathrm{pm}$.
Respectfully Submitted,
Kristen Aspinall
Planning Commission Secretary
/cem


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Interior side setbacks calculated using formula in 34-3.5.2.Gss .i
    ${ }^{2}$ Residential setbacks calculated using formula in 34-3.5.2.G.ii
    ${ }^{3}$ Street side setbacks are noted as 50 ft under 34-3.5.2.G.i
    It does not appear that any relief is being requested from the dimensional requirements of the Ordinance.

